



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

[REDACTED]

FILE: [REDACTED] Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER Date: JUL 28 2008
[WAC 05 090 76857]
[WAC 08 092 51636, motion]

IN RE: Applicant: [REDACTED]

APPLICATION: Application for Temporary Protected Status under Section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1254

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT: Self-represented

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.


Robert P. Wiemann, Chief
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The application was denied by the Director, California Service Center. A subsequent appeal was dismissed by the Director, Administrative Appeals Office (AAO). The applicant filed two motions to reopen which the director rejected as improperly filed. The AAO withdrew the director's decision based on the director's lack of jurisdiction and dismissed the motion. The matter is again before the AAO on a motion to reopen. The motion to reopen will be dismissed and the previous decision of the AAO will be affirmed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Honduras who is seeking Temporary Protected Status (TPS) under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1254.

The director denied the application after determining that the applicant failed to establish he was eligible for late registration.

Upon review of the record of proceeding, the AAO concurred with the director's conclusion and dismissed the appeal on August 4, 2006.

On motion to reopen, the applicant reasserted his claim of eligibility for TPS but failed to submit any evidence in an attempt to establish his eligibility for late registration. The AAO dismissed the motion on January 3, 2008.

On a subsequent motion, the applicant states that he has been in the United States since 1997 and has provided all of the requested evidence. The applicant also reasserted his claim of eligibility for TPS but failed to submit any probative evidence in an attempt to establish his eligibility for late registration.

A motion to reopen must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding, and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2). A motion that does not meet applicable requirements shall be dismissed. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4).

The applicant's motion to reopen consists of a statement from the applicant and submission of non-probative evidence. As such, the issue on which the underlying decisions were based has not been overcome on motion.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. That burden has not been met since the applicant has not provided any new facts or additional evidence to overcome the previous decision of the AAO. Accordingly, the motion to reopen will be dismissed and the previous decision of the AAO will not be disturbed.

ORDER: The motion to reopen is dismissed. The previous decision of the AAO dated January 3, 2008, is affirmed.